The Effects Of Cooperative Learning Teachniques and Sociological Learning Styles On Academic Writing Ability

by Mardiana Mardiana

Submission date: 15-Dec-2021 09:00AM (UTC+0700)
Submission ID: 1730743288
File name: the_effect_asli.pdf (2.91M)
Word count: 4169
Character count: 23585

ASIAN EFL JOURNAL
The EFL Professional's Written Forum

The Asian EFL Journal

November 2018

Volume 20, Issue 11

Senior Editor:

Paul Robertson

Published by English Language Education Publishing

Asian EFL Journal
A Division of TESOL Asia Group
Part of SITE Ltd. Australia

http://www.asian-efl-journal.com

editor@asian-efl-journal.com
Publisher: Dr. Paul Robertson
Chief Editor: Dr. Paul Robertson
Associate Production Editor: Ramon Medriano Jr.
Assistant Copy Editor: Eva Guzman

ISSN 1738-1460

ASIAN EFL JOURNAL
The EFL Professional's Written Forum

Table of Contents

ASIAN EFL JOURNAL
The EFL Professional's Written Forum

Title

The Effects Of Cooperative Learning Techniques And Sociological Learning Styles On Academic Writing Ability

Author

Mardiana

Abstract

The objective of this research was to find out the effects of cooperative learning techniques and sociological learning styles on English academic writing ability. This research was experimental using a 2 X 2 factorial design conducted at English Education Department of UIN Alauddin Makassar in 2011. The data were collected through an academic writing test and Sociological Learning Styles Inventory. The data analysis and interpretation indicated: (1) The English academic writing ability of the students who learned through CWRG-SE technique and through CS technique without interaction with learning styles did not show any significant difference; (2) The English academic writing ability of the students who preferred GBSB and who preferred GBSI without interaction with learning techniques did not show any significant difference; (3) There was an interaction effect between cooperative learning techniques and sociological learning styles on the English academic writing ability of the students;

Keywords: *cooperative learning techniques, sociological learning styles, academic writing, and experimental*

Introduction

Based on the preliminary study conducted by the researcher, it was found that the problems in writing English at English Education Department of UIN Alauddin Makassar were writing and researching ability as well as the bureaucracy that should be endured by the students. The main problem was then considered as the biggest obstacle was the limited ability of scientific writing in English related to the thesis content ranging from the preparation of the background to the writing techniques. As a result, many of those who do not think for the long

term and then offense by using the shortcut ways to solve those problems. Students are often found quoting other works in part or whole by simply changing the location of the study and researcher's name of the previous thesis. This is commonly referred to plagiarism as a kind of thefts or copyrights infringement, or more commonly known as copy-paste conducted by students. This informal interviews conducted by the researchers to 20 students who are undergoing coaching thesis on Monday, December 20, 2015.

Practically, it had not found so far a clear formulation dealing with the scientific writing learning techniques used by lecturers in classes with courses supporting thesis writing. Based on the observations caonducted by the researcher, there was a variation performed by teachers on subjects Writing. Some of them implement learning strategies that refer to product writing with classical learning model. These methods were classified as conventional ways because students were asked to write (Harmer, 2004: 4) on the sentence to discourse level on the topic that had been determined by the lecturers. For teachers who apply the writing proces, the steps carried out start with planning to editing, but the treatment was still in the classical with the lecture method (Ghaith, 2002; Gillet, 2010; Wardani, 2007; Akhadiah, Arsjad, and Ridwan, 1996; and McCrimmon , 1984). They did not apply groups or pairs teaching strategy on the course so it looked low interaction among the students in the class.

To respond this issues, the lecturers as facilitator are expected to solve the problems with increasing their creativities by pursuing various innovative breakthrough in the use of methods and techniques for appropriate writing learning. In addition, teachers also need to direct the student's mastery of language skills to be applied in real situations contextually. Some innovations in the field of language teaching methodology have been conducted and published in various journals teaching languages to assist language teachers to improve their services to accommodate the students' learning needs in the class. Two fundemental things assumed as the cause of problems in the preliminary observation were the use of cooperative learning model and the use of student learning styles that have not been optimized. On the basis of the description, it is necessary to conduct a series of studies focused on the students' problems in scientific writing in English that happens to Engish Education Department of UIN Alauddin Makassar.

2

Cooperative Writing Response Group and Self-Evaluation (CWRG-SE)

CWRG-SE is a learning technique that combines product and process orientation by relying on a positive response to the results of the writing group (Johnson, 1994: 26; Anthony,

1963). The group writing is a small group consisting of 3-4 people who do the writing learning activities (Medsker and Holdsworth, 2001: 287). The cooperation is intended as a response to the role of cooperation between the 'author' and 'reader' (audience) by providing a response or feedback about the positive sides or the advantages and strengths found in teammates' writing content (Porto, 2001). This writing learning techniques was developed by Porto in 1997 as the result of merging Cooperative Writing Response Group technique developed by Bryan (1996: 188-193) with an additional element of Self-Evaluation developed by Hansen (1996: 188-195).

Cooperative Script (CS)

CS (Lambiotte et al, 1988: 103) was introduced by Dansereau (1985: 209) as "A study method in the which students work in pairs and take turns Orally summarizing sections of material to be learned." The free translation of this definition is a learning technique that sets the students work in pairs and take turns summarizing portions of the materials studied (Newbern et al, 1994; Spurlin et al, 1984: 451-463; & Fuchs and Fuchs, 1998: 57-74). In other sources, it has not been found another definition of CS.

Sociological Learning Styles

Sociological learning styles or commonly called Sociological preferences in learning as a fraction of 5 groups of learning styles was introduced in 1978 by proponents of learning style, Dr. Rita Dunn, director of the Research Center for Learning and Teaching Styles St. John's University. Sociological Learning styles generally is defined as a preference in receiving, processing, and storing information or new knowledge with social orientation of individuals, in pairs, small groups, teams, guided by the teacher (authority learning/figure) or mixtures (Dunn and Dunn, 1998: 47). The term of 'sociological' on the model offered Dunn and Dunn (1978: 54) does not refer to social conditions in the sense or a broad scale, but only related to the tendency of students' options who like to learn by theirself, or with colleagues, or motivated by a figure or teacher authority.

Research Method

This study applied experimental method with factorial design 2x2. It aimed to find out the influence technique cooperative learning (CWRG-SE and CS) and learning sociological styles (GBSB and GBSI) on the ability of scientific writing in English on 60 samples of the sixth semester students of English Education Department at UIN Alauddin Makassar.

The instrument used to measure the students' ability in scientific writing was writing scientific test developed based on the six components of writing technique (the developing ideas (ideas); structuring or organizing ideas through the process of deductive and inductive reasoning (organization); adjusting argument to the topic or theme (voice); using words in scientific terms (word choice); using cohesive and coherent sentences (sentence fluency); and using punctuation and spelling (conventions). To determine the learning style, it waas used 50 items of sociological learning styles Questionnaire with 3 options.

The findings of scientific writing test were obtained by analyzing the correlation between 0.708 to 0.872 that were greater than the rtable value with db29 and α0,05 (0,367). In other hands, all the items being the assessment criteria were declared as valid. For reliability with Cronbach Alfa equivalent to KR-20 on SPSS is 0841, greater than the 0411 Alfa table at db17 and α0.05 or the 18th items of the instrument were reliable. For learning styles questionnaire, 10 out of 60 items were invalid on the value rtable with db 59 at α0.05 (0.2523) – they are the number 14 (0.099) 15 (0.113) 16 (0.172) 17 (0.047), 18 (0.149) 27 (0.083) 30 (0.058) 37 (0.158) 38 (0.210), and 39 (0.213) so that 50 items were still valid. The reliability value with Cronbach Alpha was 0.929 – it was far from the Alfa table 0.2763 at db 49 and α0.05 or the 50 items of the instrument were quite reliable.

The data was analyzed using descriptive statistical calculation of frequency distribution (f), mean ($\bar{X}$), and standard deviation (SD); and inferential factorial ANOVA or General Liner Model to test the effect of the variabels with 2 x 2 factorial design (main effects and interaction effects) at the significance level □0.05 or 95% valid level. The analysis of factorial ANOVA was conducted after testing normality and homogeneity data. If the analysis showed an interaction, then the test was continued with Tukey test to see which treatment was superior. The data were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Packages for Social Sciences). The results of the data analysis were presented in tables and graphs if it deemed necessary.

Findings And Discussion

Data Description on Group and Subgroups

The mean scores for CWRG-SE group (A1) were 2.67 with a standard deviation of 1.01; CS CS (A2) with a mean of 2.73 and standard deviation of 0.96; GBSB (B1) with a mean of 2.75 and standard deviation of 0.97; and GBSI (B2) with a mean of 2.65 and standard deviation of 0.99. The mean scores for CWRG-SE supggroups combines with GBSB (A1B1)

was 3.48 with a standard deviation of 0.62; CS combined with GBSB (A2B1) with a mean of 2.02 and standard deviation of 0.66; CWRG-SE combined with GBSI (A1B2) with a mean of 1.87 and standard deviation of 0.56; and CS combined with GBSB (A2B2) with a mean of 3.44 and standard deviation of 0.63.

The Findings of Analysus Requirements Test (Normality and Homogeneity)

The normality test criteria through Lilliefors accepted Ho if the probability score was Lo>α0.05, and rejected Ho if the probability score was Lo<α0.05.

Ho: Data derived from a population of normal distribution

H1: Data dis not come from populations with normal distribution

The findings of normality test at the significance level and db30 for the group and db15 for the group and for subgroups by using SPSS obtained data as follows:

Tabel 4. The Findings of Normality Test

Groups	Db	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]	Value α	Range	Conclusion
A1	30	0,200	0,05	0,200 > 0,05	Distributed normally
A2	30	0,560	0,05	0,560 > 0,05	Distributed normally
B1	30	0,050	0,05	0,050 ≥ 0,05	Distributed normally
B2	30	0,200	0,05	0,200 > 0,05	Distributed normally
A1B1	15	0,200	0,05	0,200 > 0,05	Distributed normally
A2B1	15	0,002	0,05	0,002 < 0,05	Not distributed normally
A1B2	15	0,130	0,05	0,130 > 0,05	Distributed normally

A2B2	15	0,200	0,05	0,200 > 0,05	Distributed normally

[a] Lilliefors Significance Correction

Lavene test was used to test the homogeneity of the data. The criteria for decision-making based on the magnitude of the probability value compared to the value α0,05. If the probability value was greater than or equal to the value of α (≥ 0.05), we concluded that the data came from populations with the same variance or homogeneous. Results of homogeneity test in SPSS with 3 variants of the following data: (a) the value of the probability variant learning techniques CWRG-SE (A1) and CS (A2) was 0.775> 0.05; (b) the learning styles variant GBSB (B1) and GBSI (B2) was 0,829> 0,05; and (c) 4 groups factorial variance of learning techniques and learning styles (A1B1, A2B1, A2B1, and A2B2) was 0.839> 0.05. It can be concluded that all groups of data derived from populations having the same variant or homogeneous and received the null hypothesis (Ho).

Hypothesis Test Findings

The findngs of factorial ANOVA calculation or General Linear Model - Univariate with SPSS were presented in the tables below:

Tabel 5. Descriptive Data among the variants

Depedend Variabel: Writing Ability

Learning Techniques	Learning Styles	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
CWRG-SE (A1)	GBSB (B1)	3,48	0,62	15
	GBSI (B2)	1,87	0,56	15
	Total 1	2,67	1,01	30
CS (A2)	GBSB (B1)	2,02	0,66	15
	GBSI (B2)	3,44	0,63	15
	Total 2	2,73	0,96	30
Total	GBSB (B1)	2,75	0,97	30
	GBSI (B2)	2,65	0,99	30
	Total 1 + 2	2,70	0,98	60

The findings of variant tests between the variables of learning techniques and learning Styles as follows:

Tabel 6. The Findings of ANAVA Test

Dependent Variabel: Writing Score

Dependent Variabel: Writing Score

Variant Sources	The Sum of Squares Type III	db	Mean Squares	F_h	Sig.	Non-centerd Parameter	Observed power[b]
Corrected Model	34,92[a]	3	11,64	30,39	0,009	1,16	1,00
Interception	438,21	1	438,21	1144,01	0,001	144,01	1,00
Learning Techniques (k)	0,05	1	0,05	0,12	0,730	0,12	0,06
Learning Styles (b)	0,14	1	0,14	0,37	0,550	0,37	0,09
Learning Techniques* Learning styles	34,73	1	34,73	90,67	0,009	0,67	1,00
Errors	21,45	560	,38				
Total	494,58	60					
Total Corrected	56,37	59					

a. Squares R = 0,619 (Squares Adjustment R = 0,599)

b. Calculated by alfa = ,05

The findings of Tukey test can be seen on the Table 7 as follows:

Table 7. The Findings of Tukey Test

Group Pairs compared	Q_{hitung}	Q_{tabel}	**Range**	**Conclusion**
Q_1 (A1B1 dan A2B1)	9,21	3,01	9,21 > 3,01	Significant
Q_2 (A1B2 dan A2B2)	-9,91	3,01	-9,91 < 3,01	Not Significant
Q_3 (A1B1 dan A1B2)	10,18	3,01	10,18 > 3,01	Significant
Q_4 (A2B1 dan A2B2)	-8,95	3,01	-8,95 < 3,01	Not Significant

Hypothesis 1 – accepting Ho: Fh = 0,12 (Fh 0,12 < Ft 4,03); (0,73 > 0,05), (students' scientific writing ability in English that learns through CWRG-SE and CS techniques were not significantly different).

In the description previously, the findings described the comparison of scientific writing class findings with two different writing learning techniques and ignore the aspect of sociological tendency of students' learning styles. Learning writing through CWRG-SE technique applied the 'process writing' model and was designed in group learning situations in the small groups (3-4 people) as compared with the CS technique which also accommodates 'process writing' models that is designed in pairs learning situation.

The important thing should be understood among students that there were individual feel more comfort studying in group – other sides, there were also students choose studying in pairs as well as individual. The data showed that hypothesis Ho was accepted and then implicated to the efforts in developing and completing cooperative learning technique especially for CWRG-SE and CS models that should consider other variables if it will be applied in scientific writing course.

Hypothesis 2 – accepting Ho: Fh = 0,37 (Fh 0,12 < Ft 4,03); (0,55 > 0,05), (there was no differeces between students' ability of scientific writing in English between those who prefers to GBSBd and GBSI).

It indicated that sociological learning style preferences intended as an approach to learning that relate to students' sociological dimension predisposition factors. The findings showed that the students' sociological learning style preferences were also not a single variable that affects the ability of scientific writing in English at the Department. It was explained by the utterly rejected the alternative hypothesis that there were differences in students' ability of scientific writing in English between those who prefer to GBSB and GBSI.

The findings above implied that the variables of sociological learning style were not strong enough to be used as the sole factor that determines the success of the students in learning scientific writing in English. Another implication leads to the truth of theoretical filed by proponents of the learning style that even the learning styles tend to be fixed, especially the factors on physical and environment variables, but the factors in emotional and sociological variables (individual study, orientation in pairs, etc.) There are still opportunities to change along with the person's cognitive development and maturation. Therefore, the understanding of sociological learning styles and the elements were directed toward learning techniques

alignment flexibility for grouping aspects of learning that can be arranged so that students feel the justice in acquiring the rights to study.

Hypothesis 3 – rejecting Ho:Fh = 90,67 (Fh 90,67 > Ft 4,03); (0,00 < 0,05), (Between learning techniques and learning style preferences owned by students, there were interaction effects that result in differences in students' scientific writing ability in English).

The findings showed the interaction between cooperative learning techniques with the sociological learning style preferences that significantly affect students' ability in scientific writing in English. Cooperative learning techniques (CWRG-SE and CS) in relative terms will effectively affect students' writing skills when learning style preferences correspond to the sociological (GBSB and GBSI) they have.

The findings above have not been explained about the group partner of learning techniques and learning styles that was superior to be used in learning scientific writing in English. The findings only give information about whether or not there is interaction between the variables tested. In other words, the adjustment of students' sociological learning styles with the cooperative learning techniques in this study comprises the interaction that takes place on scientific writing teaching and learning activities using English. Interaction in the activities that establish the interaction of physical, psychological, and social between students and faculty. Their interaction relationship has implications on the students' ability in scientific writing in English which also indirectly affect their cognitive development, conative, affective, and psychomotor (not included in the component being measured).

Conclusions

The conclusiong were; 1) the students' ability in scientific writing in English between those who learn through CWRG-SE and CS techniques without elaborating the learning style has not shown a significant difference; 2) the students' ability in scientific writing in English between those who prefer GBSB and GBSI without elaborating with learning techniques have not shown a significant difference; and 3) there was influence of the interaction between cooperative learning techniques and sociological learning styles of the students' ability in scientific writing using English.

It is suggested that; 1) the learning techniques that are tailored to the students' learning styles of students is a factor which influenced the increase of students' learning achievement. Therefore, there should be training for lecturers in form of refreshment in implementing

cooperative learning techniques, as well as other actual and accommodative techniques; 2) workshop for teaching scientific writing that is mainly associated with the students' thesis writing should be held to a unified vision in instruction and assessment and coaching thesis. This was deemed necessary given the constraints in terms of maintaining the lecturers' ego tendency on techniques and scientific writing process for students in accordance with their own background and experience; and 3) it should be considered to form a special team consisting of expert in teaching material design and learning style inventory design that will be able to work together to design a scientific writing learning program centered on students, especially in UIN Alauddin Makassar..

References

Akhadiah, S., Arsjad, M. G., dan Ridwan, S. H. Pembinaan Kemampuan Menulis Bahasa Indonesia. Jakarta: Erlangga, 1996.

Anthony, E. M. "Approach, Method and Technique". English Language Teaching, 17: p. 63-7, 1963.

Bryan, L. H. "Cooperative Writing Groups in Community College", An Article in Journal of Adolecsent & Adult Literacy, Vol. 40/3, pp. 188 – 193, November 1996, International Reading Association.

Dansereau, D. F. "Transfer from Cooperative to Individual Studying. Journal of Reading, p. 614-618, April, 1987.

_____. "Learning Strategy Research", In J. W. Segal, S. F. Chipman, and R. Glaser (Eds.), Thinking and Learning Skills: Vol. 1, Relating instruction to research. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1985.

_____., Collins, K. W., McDonald, B. A., Holley, C. D., Garland, J. C., Diekhoff, G., and Evans, S. H. "Development and Evaluation of A Learning Strategy Program. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71, p. 64-73, 1979.

Dunn, R. and Dunn, K. Practical Approaches to Individualizing Staff Development for Adults. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998.

Dunn, R. and Dunn, K. Teaching Students through Their Individual Learning Styles: A Practical Approach. Reston, VA: Reston Publishing. 1978.

Fuchs, L. S., and Fuchs, D. "Acquisition and Transfer Effects of Classwide Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies in Mathematics for Students with Varying Learning Histories", School Psychology Review, 24 (4), 604-621.1995.

Ghaith, G. “Writing”, In Nada’s ESL Island, February 2002,

Hansen, J. “Evaluation: The Center of Writing Instruction’. The Reading Teacher, (50), 3, 188–95, 1996.

Harmer, J. How to Teach Writing. London: Pearson, 2004

Johnson, D. W., and Johnson, R. Learning Together and Alone: Cooperative, Competitive, and Individualistic Learning. (4th Edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1994.

Lambiotte, J. G., Dansereau D. F., O'Donnell, A. M., Young, M. D., Skaggs, L. P., and Hall, R. H. “Effects of Cooperative Script Manipulations on Initial Learning and Transfer”. Cognition and Instruction, 5, p. 103-121, 1988.

McCrimmon, J.M. Writing with a Purpose. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1984.

Medsker, K. L., and Holdsworth, K. M. Models and Strategies for Training Design. Maryland: ISPI, 2001.

Newbern, D., Dansereau, D.F., Patterson, M.E., and Wallace, D.S. “Toward a Science of Cooperation”, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April, 1994.

Porto, M. “Cooperative Writing Response Groups and Self-Evaluation. An Article. ELT Journal Volume 55/1 January 2001, p. 38 – 46. Oxford:Oxford University Press, 2001.

Wardani, I.G.K. Karangan Ilmiah. Jakarta: Penerbit UT, 2007.

The Effects Of Cooperative Learning Teachniques and Sociological Learning Styles On Academic Writing Ability

ORIGINALITY REPORT

19%	19%	8%	%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	jasce.jp Internet Source	4%
2	bahasauhamka.files.wordpress.com Internet Source	4%
3	repository.usd.ac.id Internet Source	3%
4	www.jiskha.com Internet Source	1%
5	epdf.pub Internet Source	1%
6	digilib.iain-palangkaraya.ac.id Internet Source	1%
7	www.cambridge.org Internet Source	1%
8	www.chemed4u.net Internet Source	1%
9	www.readingrockets.org Internet Source	1%

10	www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov Internet Source	1 %
11	mafiadoc.com Internet Source	1 %
12	saacc56a95d7259f4.jimcontent.com Internet Source	1 %
13	www.studystack.com Internet Source	1 %

Exclude quotes	Off	Exclude matches	< 1%
Exclude bibliography	Off		